



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,646	10/27/2003	Anuja Patel	PARCR 65197	3988

24201 7590 09/24/2007
FULWIDER PATTON LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/694,646	Applicant(s) PATEL ET AL.	
	Examiner George P. Wyszomierski	Art Unit 1742	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2007 and 21 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 8/21/07 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/9/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1742

1. Replacement drawing sheets were received on August 21, 2007. These drawings are acceptable, and will be used as the drawings in this application.
2. The previous Office Action included a rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, based on the term "in an ingot state" in the claims. The examiner accepts Applicant's explanation that the "claim defines when the alloy is in the ingot state, it has these characteristics, which when processed, will produce wire, ribbon, sheet, or tubing having high fatigue life." The examiner cautions that the instant claims are not directed to ingots, but rather to a "high fatigue life wire, ribbon, sheet or tubing" (claim 1), a "wire, ribbon, sheet or tubing made from a high fatigue life shape memory material" (claim 10), or a "medical device for implantation" (claim 22). Properties or conditions of the claimed material at some point in the past, but not necessarily present in the claimed material, will be given little weight in determining patentability of the instant claims.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 1742

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Beard (PG Pub. 2002/0005047).

Beard discloses Ni-Ti wires that are round in cross section, and have a composition, an A_f temperature, an ultimate tensile strength, and an elongation value as presently claimed. Note particularly Alloy #1 in paragraph [0007] of Beard. Thus, all physical aspects of the claimed invention appear to be fully disclosed (in the sense of 35 USC 102) by the Beard reference.

Beard does not specify that the material disclosed therein has undergone a cold work and anneal cycle, i.e. does not disclose the process steps recited in product-by-process terms in claim 1, and does not specify the conditions under which elongation and tensile strength were measured. However, it is well settled that a product-by-process claim defines a product, and that when the prior art discloses a product substantially the same as that being claimed, differing only in the manner by which it is made, the burden falls to applicant to show that any process steps associated therewith result in a product materially different from that disclosed in the prior art. See *In re Brown* (173 USPQ 685) and *In re Fessman* (180 USPQ 524). Given that all composition, shape, and mechanical properties as claimed are present in the Beard materials, Applicant has not met this burden. With regard to the testing conditions, it is a reasonable assumption that testing was conducted under standard conditions by Beard, in the absence of any particular statement to the contrary. Thus, at a minimum, the claimed invention is held to have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art from the disclosure of Beard.

5. Claims 7, 8 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard.

With respect to claims 7 and 8, Alloy #1 of Beard is stated to contain <0.5% of C, O and Fe, which overlaps the amounts recited in the instant claims. Beard makes no mention of Cu, H, or "any other single trace element" and therefore the examiner assumes that the amounts of these elements in the Beard materials are negligible. Thus, no patentable distinction is seen between this aspect of the claimed invention and the Beard disclosure. With respect to claims 10-12 and 14, Beard does not specify the fatigue life value as presently claimed. However, Beard paragraph [0006] indicates that a typical fatigue life of the prior art materials is 10,000 cycles at 2% strain and 1,000,000 cycles at 0.5% strain; extrapolating these figures to the claimed conditions (0.75% strain), a value of >20,000 cycles for the prior art material appears reasonable. All statements made in item no. 4 supra with regard to product-by-process limitations apply equally as well in this instance. With respect to claim 13, Beard paragraph [0019] discloses a size range in the prior art that includes the entire range as presently claimed. Thus, a prima facie case of obviousness is established between the disclosure of Beard and the presently claimed invention.

6. Claims 5, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard, as above, in view of Ishibe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,230,348).

With respect to claim 5, while Beard does not appear to disclose any polygonal cross-section shaped materials, Beard paragraph [0011] states that the prior art materials may be formed into wires, rods or other shapes. Then, Ishibe Figures 5-9 indicate that polygonal cross-section materials were known to be equivalent in the art to the round cross-section materials disclosed by Beard, in the context of wires made from Ti-55.8%Ni alloy materials.

With respect to claims 22 and 23, Beard paragraph [0019] indicates that the prior art material may be made in the form of a plurality of braided wires, i.e. analogous to that defined in

claim 23. Beard does not specify a "medical device for implantation" as required by the instant claims. However, it is unclear what particular physical form is implied by this limitation, as medical devices may be formed into a wide variety of shapes for diverse applications. Ishibe indicates that it was known in the art, at the time of the invention, to employ Ti-55.8%Ni wires (the same material as Beard) as guide wires for catheters, i.e. as medical devices. All statements made in item no. 4 supra with regard to product-by-process limitations and testing conditions apply equally as well in this instance.

Thus, the combined disclosures of Beard and Ishibe et al. would have taught the invention as presently claimed to one of ordinary skill in the art.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard, alone or in view of either Iwai et al. (U.S. Patent 5,334,294) or Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,375,826).

Beard, discussed supra, does not appear to disclose a surface that is at least partially polished. However, the purpose of Beard is to make jewelry, and it is thus a reasonable assumption that one of skill in the art would want to have a polished, aesthetically pleasing surface in the materials of Beard. In any event, both Iwai and Wang indicate that it was known in the art, at the time of the invention, to electropolish wires made of Ni-Ti alloy, i.e. a material analogous to that of Beard. This allows one to achieve a very smooth surface of a desired shape. Thus, the disclosure of Beard, combined with that of Iwai et al. or Wang et al., would have taught the presently claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art.

8. In a response filed June 28, 2007, Applicant suggests that the claimed invention can be distinguished from Beard because it is uncertain at what stage any of the

property measurements disclosed by Beard were actually conducted (e.g. as ingot, wire, etc). However, it is first noted that any properties of an ingot are largely irrelevant to the present situation, as stated in item no. 2 *supra*. More particularly, Applicant has provided no showing that any properties of the claimed material (i.e. as a wire or a medical device as claimed) are actually different than the properties of the wires as produced by Beard. While Applicant speculates that the fatigue life of the claimed material is different, Applicant has presented no actual data showing any particular difference in fatigue life or any other aspect of the claimed invention versus an equivalent property in the prior art.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1742

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the central facsimile number, (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


GEORGE WYSZOMIERSKI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1742

GPW

September 17, 2007